

## 32.7.2

25a (משנה ג) → 26a (בצאתו מיד אחר)

1. ואם לא יגאל את השדה ואם מכר את השדה לאיש אחר לא יגאל עוד: ויקרא כו, כ  
 2. ואם אחר היבל יקדיש שדהו וחשב לו להלחן את הכסף על פי השנים הנותרת עד שנת היבל ונגרע מערפך: ויקרא כז, יח  
 3. והיה השדה בצאתו ביבל קדש לה' כשדה החרם לפה תהיה אהזתו: ויקרא כז, כא  
 4. בשנת היבל ישוב השדה לאשר קנהו מאתו לאשר לו אהזת הארץ: ויקרא כז, כד

- I ג משנה ג: status of שדה אחוזה after redemption (pre-יובל)
- a If: he or his son redeemed it – doesn't leave father's possession at יובל
  - b However, if: anyone else redeemed it, goes to כהנים at יובל
  - c כהנים: if a redeems it, he can't argue that since it goes to כהנים at יובל, he may keep it
    - i Rather: it gets divided among כהנים of that משמר
    - ii Reason: v. 3 – only keeps it if it is אחוזה
- II ברייתא: interpreting v. 1
- a 1<sup>st</sup> clause: refers to the owner; 2<sup>nd</sup> clause: refers to גזבר; 3<sup>rd</sup> clause: refers to anyone besides his son
    - i Counter: perhaps it refers to anyone besides his brother
    - ii Block: "איש" refers to brother – but בן is not an אחר
      - 1 Argument: בן is closer to father, as he takes his place for יעוד and for ownership of עבד עברי
      - 2 Counter: brother is closer as he takes the place of dead brother for ייבום
        - (a) Block: ייבום only comes about if there is no son → if there is a son, he is closer
      - 3 Question: why not prove supremacy of בן as he has 2 points of contact (עבד עברי)?
      - 4 Answer: עבד עברי is also inferred from this point (i.e. that עבד עברי goes to son, not brother)
    - iii Question (רבה בר אבונה): can a daughter keep field in family (as does son)?
      - 1 Lemma1: since for purposes of מייבום, פטור daughter=son, she can play same role for field,
      - 2 Lemma2: since for נחלה she is "like an outsider" – ineffective
      - 3 Answer: from תדברי – anyone is an אחר in the place of the son (and so is she)
    - iv Question (ר' זירא): who is the "close one" for a woman (who is מלוג מקדיש her)?
      - 1 Lemma1: could be husband, as he inherits from her
      - 2 Lemma2: could be son, as he inherits ראוי just like מוחזק – תיקו
    - v Question (ר' מר"ח): if a field is מוקדש less than 2 years before יובל, does it automatically go to כהנים?
      - 1 Response: is the thinking, per vv. 2-3, that if there is no גרעון, no גאולה?
      - (a) Rejection: however, v. 1 proves that if it can be redeemed, it may be and not go to כהנים – as in this case
- III משנה ד: status of שדה אחוזה which isn't redeemed before יובל
- a הקדש enter the field and take possession – but redeem it from קדש
    - i Reason: infers קדש from קדש בית – in that case, must pay to redeem (unlike כבשי עצרת, these are both בבית הבית)
  - b כהנים enter the field and take possession – without any redemption-payment
    - i Reason: infers קדש from קדש עצרת – just like that קרבן is given to כהנים as gift – so too with כהנים חרמי
      - 1 And: unlike מקדיש בית, these are both מתנות לכהן
  - c they neither take possession nor pay – rather it is called שדה רטושין (abandoned) in perpetuity
    - i Until: someone else redeems it – then it goes to כהנים at the next יובל
      - 1 א"א's reason: רבה – read v. 1 as לא יגאל...לא יגאל עוד; but אם מכר...אם לא יגאל
        - (a) Challenge (אב"י): how can we cut up the פסוק this way?
        - (b) Rather (אב"י): per ברייתא (which must be authored by ר"א, as per below): לא יגאל might have meant that it cannot be considered as שדה מקנה, but "עוד" indicates that it just can't revert to שדה אחוזה, but is שדה מקנה
          - (i) When: this must be יובל שני (else it is שדה אחוזה) and that is only meaningful for ר"א
          - (ii) Challenge: ר"י ור"ש have to interpret "עוד"
            1. Rather: the verse refers to a field that went to כהנים, one of whom was מקדיש and the original owners came to redeem it; סד"א they can't redeem at all → עוד – but can be redeemed as שדה מקנה
            2. Support: ברייתא interpreting v. 4
              - a. Justification: if we only had לא יגאל, would apply to field that doesn't go back
                - i. And: if we only had קנהו, here, where בעלים are paying, סד"א it goes back to them
                - ii. And: we need עוד to teach that it can go back as שדה מקנה
- (c) Resolution (רבה): ר"א's reason – בצאתו (v. 3) – when it leaves another's possession